

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ROCK HILL DIVISION

| | | |
|------------------------------------|---|--|
| Keith Adger Smyth, |) | Civil Action No.: 0:14-cv-3476-RBH-PJG |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | ORDER |
| |) | |
| Major Neal Urch; PREA Amandy |) | |
| Blanton; William J. Church; Deputy |) | |
| J. Brock; Deputy K. Ashley, |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |
| |) | |

Plaintiff Keith Adger Smyth (“Plaintiff”), a state pretrial detainee proceeding *pro se*, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on August 28, 2014. *See* Compl., ECF No. 1. Plaintiff later amended his complaint on September 12, 2014. *See* Am. Compl., ECF No. 13. Plaintiff subsequently filed two motions for a temporary restraining order. *See* ECF Nos. 69 and 83. Defendants responded in opposition to both of these motions, *see* ECF Nos. 84 and 95, and Plaintiff replied in support of his motions, *see* ECF Nos. 97 and 110. The matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“R & R”) of United States Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina. *See* R & R, ECF No. 120. In the Report and Recommendation, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the Court deny Petitioner’s motions for a temporary restraining order. *See id.* at 4.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this Court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific

objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

No party has filed objections to the Report and Recommendation. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendations. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

After a thorough review of the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is adopted and incorporated by reference. Therefore, it is **ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s motions for a temporary restraining order, ECF Nos. 69 and 83, are **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ R. Bryan Harwell
R. Bryan Harwell
United States District Judge

Florence, South Carolina
March 3, 2015